



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/996,510	11/27/2001	Kenneth Y. Chiu	5181-95300	2233

7590 08/04/2006

Rory D. Rankin
Conley, Rose & Tayon, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767

EXAMINER

BRADLEY, MATTHEW A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2187

DATE MAILED: 08/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/996,510

Applicant(s)

CHIU, KENNETH Y.

Examiner

Matthew Bradley

Art Unit

2187

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 13 July 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See continuation sheet. *ms*
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.


Brian R. Peugh
Primary Examiner

Response to Arguments

Continuation of request for reconsideration/other:

With respect to applicant's argument located within the last paragraph on page 10 of the instant arguments which recites:

"...Even were one to equate the intra-cache line address of Arimilli with the recited mask, which Applicant does not agree with, there is clearly no disclosure of "generating a different address for each of said sub-blocks in response to receiving the transfer request."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in Arimilli et al (U.S. 6,192,458), hereinafter referred to as Arimilli, column 5 lines 40-42, address tags tag_a and tag_b are selected from the cache directory. The selection of specific address tags from a plurality of address tags, from the presented address, which is then output to the comparators, anticipates the instant limitation of generating by selecting and outputting.

With respect to applicant's argument located within the third full paragraph on page 11 of the instant arguments which recites:

"Other non-disclosed features are included in the dependent claims as well. For example claim 3 recites the mask includes a separate bit for each of the sub-blocks, and the value off a single bit indicates whether a corresponding sub-block is required. In contrast, Arimilli discloses either a 6 or 7 bit address to identify one of 64 or 128 bytes, respectively."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. As shown in Arimilli, the transfer request as a whole includes the mask. As the transfer request is broken up and compared, a single bit is then output to the final multiplexer (210) at which point a separate bit distinguishes between each of the data blocks. Accordingly, Arimilli teach a separate bit for each of the sub-blocks.

With respect to applicant's argument located within the fourth full paragraph on page 11 of the instant arguments which recites:

"Further, claim 5 recites concurrent generation of the sub-block addresses. As noted in the discussion above, Arimilli does not disclose the generation of different addresses as recited in claim 1."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees and refers applicants to the comments made *supra* with respect to claim 1.

With respect to applicant's argument located within the fourth full paragraph on page 11 of the instant arguments which further recites:

"Claim 6 recites "selecting a first address". Applicant finds no such feature disclosed in Arimilli."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees and incorporates by reference herein the comments made *supra* with respect to claim 1. Additionally, after the selection of specific address tags which are then output to the comparators, the comparators then compare the specific address tags with the tag field of the presented address, thus selecting a first address.

With respect to applicant's argument located within the fourth full paragraph on page 11 of the instant arguments which further recites:

"With respect to claim 7, Arimilli does not disclose "masking off said first bit."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees and incorporates by reference herein the comments made *supra* with respect to claim 1. Additionally, the Examiner notes that the comparators and multiplexers of Arimilli act as masks together as noted in the comments made *supra* with respect to claim 3. MB